

REMARKS

The applicant has carefully considered the Office action dated November 14, 2007, and the references it cites. In the official action, all claims were rejected as being unpatentable over Moyne et al. (US Pat. No. 7,109,979) under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). It is respectfully submitted that the claim amendments obviate any rejection that may have been proper. The applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added to the claims. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Independent claim 1 is allowable. Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a method to provide a handheld pointer-based user interface with a first communication link that receives one or more HCI signals having different codes and a second communication link to transmit at least one of position information and operating information. The applicants respectfully submit that Moyne et al. do not teach or suggest HCI signals having different codes.

In particular, Moyne et al. describes a stylus having two transmitters that convey position signals and timing signals, respectively. In the system of Moynet et al., “the timing signal may be transmitted from the stylus 12 to the detector 12 in order to synchronize the stylus 12 with the detector assembly 14.” *See Moyne et al., 5:53-55.* In addition, “the position signals are transmitted at a known time after the timing signal is transmitted” in order to determine the time of flight of the position signals. *See Moyne et al., 5:60-61.* The timing signal is “preferably significantly faster than the position signal”

so that the system of Moyne et al. can “disregard the time of flight of the timing signal when determining the time of flight of the position signals.” *See Moyne et al., 6:19 and 6:22-24.* As a result, because of the timing signal, the detector assembly always knows to expect a position signal. *See Moyne et al., 6:19 and 6:22-24.* The detector assembly then computes the position of the stylus based on the time difference in receiving the timing signal and the position signal, both of which will always be the same in the operation of the stylus of Moyne et al. That is, in response to receiving the timing signal, the detector assembly of Moyne et al. knows to expect a position signal, which will always have the same contents. In addition, to distinguish the eraser of Moyne et al., the eraser conveys either a position signal or a timing signal that is different from the stylus to determine that “the signals being received are from the eraser 16 as opposed to the stylus 12.” *See Moyne et al., 4:58-59.* In contrast, claim 1 recites HCI signals having different codes.

Independent claim 10, 17, and 24 are also patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above in association with claim 1. Therefore, the applicants submit that independent claims 10, 17, 24 and all claims dependent thereon are in condition for allowance.

If the examiner is of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this case, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number identified below.

U.S. Serial No. 10/697,672
Response to the Office Action Dated October 14, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

HANLEY, FLIGHT & ZIMMERMAN, LLC.
150 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2100
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 580-1020

By: /Simon G. Booth/
Simon G. Booth
Registration No. 58,582

Date: January 14, 2008